DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 122 509 EC 082 887

AUTHOR Severns, George W., Jr.; And Others
TITLE Administration of Educational Programs for Delinquent Youth.
PUB DATE Apr 76
NOTE 29p.; Three papers presented at the Annual International Convention, The Council for Exceptional Children (54th, Chicago, Illinois, April 4-9, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administration; Adolescents; Curriculum Design; *Delinquency; *Educational Alternatives; *Educational Programs; Emotionally Disturbed; *Etiology; Exceptional Child Education; Interagency Cooperation; Secondary Education; Teaching Methods; *Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

Presented are three papers on the administration of educational programs for delinquent youth. In a paper by G. Severns the total lack of coordination between agencies when programing for delinquent youth is pointed out, and a continuum of educational programing with a maximum of communication within and among agencies is suggested. Pennsylvania's Assessment Teaching Curriculum is described in the second paper by I. Grignano as an educational alternative for delinquents which operates in conjunction with established curriculum guidelines and, therefore, assures the child of transferable school time that can be applied to school placement anywhere within the state. In a final paper, R. Bell reviews historical trends (such as crimes are now committed in areas considered safe) in the pattern of delinquency; outlines three factors (physiological, psychological, and socioeconomic) which lead to alienation, disruption, and delinquency; and recommends diagnostic/prescriptive approaches to remediate the problem. (SB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED122509

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ADMINISTRATION OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR DELINQUENT YOUTH

George W. Severns, Jr.
Special Education Adviser
Box 911
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126
Phone: (717) 787-9093
Chairperson

Area of Participation:

1 - Administration
2 - Behavioral Disorders

Length of Presentation:

Approximately 3 hours

EC082887

Dr. George W. Severns, Jr.
Special Education Adviser
Division of Special Education
Department of Education
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Box 911
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

Phone: (717) 787-9093

Will chair the panel, give a presentation on administration, conduct question and answer sessions, and summarize the presentations.

Dr. Raymond Bell
Director, Social Restoration Program
Graduate School of Education
Lehigh University
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania 18015

Phone: (215) 865-1654

Will give a presentation on the causes of alienation which lead to youth conflict with the community, and a justification for a diagnostic and prescriptive model.

Dr. Innocenzio Gregnano
Shuman Learning Center
7150 Leech Farm Road
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15206

Phone: (412) 661-6806

Will give a presentation and conduct a demonstration of a diagnostic classification of juvenile delinquents in a short term placement setting.

ABSTRACT

ADMINISTRATION OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS
FOR DELINQUENT YOUTH

The presentation began with presentation of administration of educational programs for delinquent and "delinquent prone youth", then into an outline of the causes of alienation which lead the youth into conflict with community agencies. Emphasis was placed on those psychological and philosophical factors which interact with socio-economic forces and institutional conflicts to cause alienation leading to placement in a detention facility. A paradigm was then developed, mapping out the inter-related outcomes of such factors on the conflict cycle viz: Low Self-Esteem Functional Deficit in the Decision-Making Process Self as Victim Law Self-Esteem.

The presentation also contained a demonstration and justification for a diagnostic and prescriptive intervention model for use in educational programming for the youth placed in short duration detention. This model demonstrated the role and competencies of the teachers in such programs with particular emphasis upon their liaison advocacy role in the implementation of the prescriptive plan.

George W. Severns, Jr.

ADMINISTRATION OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

FOR DELINQUENT YOUTH

Presented to the

54th Annual International Convention of the

Council for Exceptional Children

CHAIRPERSON
Dr. George W. Severns, Jr.
Special Education Adviser
Division of Special Education
Department of Education
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Box 911
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

Dr. Raymond Bell
Director
Social Restoration Program
Graduate School of Education
Lehigh University
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania 18015

Dr. Innocenzio Grignano
Shuman Learning Center
7150 Leech Farm Road
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15206

ADMINISTRATION OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR DELINQUENT YOUTH

A Paper Presented to the

54th Annual International Convention of the

Council for Exceptional Children

by

George W. Severns, Jr.

April, 1976

Department of Education

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

ADMINISTRATION OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS
FOR DELINQUENT YOUTH

The problem of chronic socially unacceptable and malajusted behavior has been a constant source of irritation from the inception of organized societies. The soaring juvenile crime rate of today is a problem of major social concern.

Programs for social deviants have grown very slowly over the last 200 years even though roughly 5 percent of the youth population manifest behavior that leads to their appearance in juvenile courts. This figure is the national average; in some urban neighborhoods it may be as high as 20 percent.

The relationship of the educational program to the total program for delinquents is often central, making whatever happens educationally the core of what occurs clinically, simply because of age and because the delinquent spends most of his/her waking hours in some type of educational program.

Education has made many notable steps forward. However, according to Ernst A. Wenk, education has failed delinquent youth. If this continues, he states, it may, in fact, fail all humanity.

While there is a vast literature on the overall subject of juvenile delinquency, there is relatively little material on education and schooling for delinquent youth. Further, there appears to be even less on the administration of educational programs for delinquent youth.

The varied structures of organization and financing of these programs must play a determining role in the efficacy of educating these children.

The variety of inconsistencies in organizational roles in providing educational programs for this population has led to inconsistencies and a lack of a continuum in educational programming.

Education has often been criticized because, according to some, it has "reacted" to problems in the educational programs for delinquent youth rather than "acted" to prevent them. This is pointed out in two typical statements made in interviews conducted with state level administrators. For example an interview with a state level Welfare administrator who stated:

> "Part of the reason they are still, in general, reacting to problems is the fact that there appears to be a lack of coordination between their various educational programs for delinquent youth."

This further pointed out the confusion that takes place when attempting to discover appropriate sources of funding various educational programs for delinquent and delinquent prone youth. There is evidence of this confusion in the following comment made by a state level budget administrator.

> "The different appropriations made to educational programs for delinquent youth causes much confusion, in that money appropriations are made to program areas, and in this case no less than three appropriations are made to one program area."

Some possible explanations for the criticism of education "reacting" in lieu of "acting" is the "patchwork" manner in which administrative efforts are currently being handled in this program area in many states. An example of this would be in some states Special Education is responsible for educational programs for youth in detention, while other Bureaus are responsible for educational programs for committed delinquents. And, the responsibility for educational programs for youth on probation or delinquent prone youth or youth in group homes has not been placed under any administrative group.

The problem appears to be a patchwork of educational and quasi-educational programming...in a vareity of settings under several agencies. Various state and local records reflect a variety of inconsistencies in providing a realistic and coordinated educational program. The varied structures of organization and financing of these institutions must play a determining role in the efficacy of educational programs for their children.

Inefficiency and confusion are predictable consequences of fragmentation.

Structure seems to have grown with no planning or coordination between major agencies. Each agency must define its role in terms of what it could and should deliver . . . the basic problem of so many different disciplines with some responsibility for "education" often results in lack of coordination.

Policy, administrative and funding responsibilities for a variety of services to delinquent and deprived children are generally fragmented at the at the State Level among and within a number of departments and agencies with little coordination exercised.

Because of the overall lack of coordination, total resources committed to youth services are generally not rationally allocated. Furthermore, there is generally no systematic attempt to measure the relative efficiency of various programs and treatment strategies, nor can there be under existing fragmented structures of funding and administration. Without a systematic and coordinated approach, the budgeting function becomes meaningless. Inefficient programs with committed funding persist and expand; potentially efficient programs and strategies cannot attract funding because of these commitments.

Most agencies have gone their own way when programming for delinquent youth, with no cooperation or coordination with others.

The problems can be resolved but generally agency restructuring is part of the solution. Specifically so as to promote better planning and the use of a pragmatic, or functional approach.

Objectives should be, at least, the development of an agency structure; accountability techniques; legal, legislative, budgetary, and other services that insure coordination of those aspects concerning programming for delinquent youth.

Discussions and research I have conducted have continually pointed out that if delinquent youth are to receive an adequate educational program, there must be a continuum of educational programming with a maximum of communication and cooperation between and within all agencies working with delinquent youth.

There is need to develop a state level administrative structure that provides the leadership, coordination, supervision, and training to solve such problems as develop at the local level. This appears more readily possible if at the State Level, the parts of the administrative structure dealing with educational programs for delinquent youth can be coordinated.

Since the state level administration of educational programs is meant to be that of coordinating, assisting, monitoring, and facilitating local administration of educational programs for delinquent youth must be a coordinated effort.

Program administrators must assure maintenance of close contact with all aspects of the juvenile's environment, including the juvenile court judge and probation offices and his local school districts, in areas of admission, progress reports, follow up, transition from custody to probation, etc.

State level administration must provide for a continuum of educational programming from the troubled or minimal behavior problem youth, to the very acting out youth, the youth on probation, the detained youth, the committed youth, the returned youth, etc.

State level administration needs a separate office, etc. to be on top of all educational problems of delinquent youth, not scattered throughout various offices, and to have one funding appropriation, and single set of goals.

There needs to be liaison responsibilities between education, and other agencies such as the court in that the judge makes placement; the probation office to assist in programming, the Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation concerning work programs, County Government concerning shelter, business concerning job try outs, the Federal Government concerning funding, etc.

If you or your state decide to study this problem, it would be wise to consider conceptual framework, studies by Dr. David Lawrence Jesser and Dr. Vaughn Averill Lacombe. Dr. Jesser concluded in 1971 that "more effective communication must be achieved between the state education agency and educators in the field."[1] Dr. Lacombe, in 1972, developed a state education agency management model that when implemented can be expected to formulate conclusions in the major areas of agency management. Three of these areas are part of the focus I used in my study of the state level administrative situation in Pennsylvania.

> (1) a view of the agency as it exists,...; reorganization along functional lines,...; and (6) a formal process whereby management can become accountable for their operation.[2]

Dr. Lacombe's study provides the alert SEA manager with the proper background and basic tools to undertake the most comprehensive internal examination of a SEA.

[1] David L. Jesser, "An Investigation of Perceptions of the Planning Function of State Education Agencies." Unpublished Doctor of Education Dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1971, p.iii.

[2] Vaughn A. Lacombe, "The Development of a Conceptual Model for Assessing Management Practices in a Model State Education Agency," Dissertation published, The University of Alabama, 1972, p. 108.

While there is a vast literature on the overall subject of juvenile delinquency, there is relatively little material on education and schooling for delinquent youth. Further, there appears to be even less on the administration of educational programs for delinquent youth.

Locally there needs to be coordinated administration also

- School district contacts
- Court contacts
- School program contacts concerning such things as
    - admission
    - records
    - follow up
    - transition
    - probation

There must be coordination between all agencies dealing with juvenile delinquents to insure, among other things, adequate diagnosis of any learning problems, counseling, accessibility to appropriate program, continuing education or training, etc.

There is a need for someone in an education program in a detention home to analyze what the child's program is and report that to someone who can do something about it.

A child develops a low self-image and begins seeing himself as a victim of society. We must diagnose the original problem and make recommendations to someone to solve them. Recommendations should be such as to not just be filed somewhere. To assure this, there must be a formal diagnostic system that depends more on common sense and understanding of children than it does on clinical training.

This type student has the dual need of having problems diagnosed and having their failure cycle broken by an accurate prescription to meet the needs diagnosed. But, unless there is an advocate, the whole theory of diagnosis and prescription for delinquent types of children is meaningless.

Information must be gathered on the juvenile delinquent's educational problems, and prescriptive recommendations passed on to the student's probation officer, judge, school from which he came and might return, and/or the institution to which he may be sent.

The teacher must recognize that detention is a temporary placement where assessment of student's strengths and weaknesses must take place, which can then be used for placement in an appropriate and alternate educational setting.

The teacher has to be a clinician, a prescriber, a counselor, and a liaison between the court. the institution, and the school system. The person who teaches in a detention home has to be unusually strong, emotionally mature, and able to deal with a good deal of ambiguity.

Since the average age of these youngsters is about 15 years, these children are generally still within the age group coming under the compulsory school attendance laws that mandate school attendance for all youth, thus making educational programs for delinquent youth mandatory. Therefore, educational programs for delinquents must take place wherever the delinquents are located. The relationship of the educational program to the total program for delinquents is often central, making whatever happens educationally the core of what occurs clinically, simply because of his/her age and because the delinquent spends most of his waking hours in an educational program.

Although many people are interested in juvenile reform for social program and the important task of educating the delinquent youth, relatively little attention has been given to the administration of programs for delinquent youth. Because education is such a major part of programming for delinquents, the administration of educational programs for delinquent youth takes on even more significance.

ASSESSMENT TEACHING CURRICULUM

A Paper Presented to the

54th Annual International Convention of the

Council for Exceptional Children

by

Innocenzio A. Grignano, Ph.D.

April, 1976

Shuman Learning Center

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

ASSESSMENT TEACHING CURRICULUM

The assessment mania currently engulfing most juvenile detention centers across the United States has been the result of many judicial and educational mandates which seek to ensure the right of "due process" for all children requiring special attention.

While the necessity for due process is not here in question, the concept of due process for children within a detention facility presents many difficulties not before encountered. Namely, the need to safeguard children's rights fr[illegible] two distinct views, law and education. Since in most instances, both due processes occur simultaneously in a juvenile court procedure, the need to acquire, assimilate and synthesize more child information is becoming increasingly difficult, if not impossible.

In years past, the task of trying to place adjudicated-delinquent children in appropriate referral agencies exhausted an already over-taxed and antiquated diagnostic and assessment system. Traditionally, the assessment format at most detention centers revolved around a social history technique and a brief psychological work-up. The child information received was in most instances limited and dealt with a child's emotional state and his intellectual quotient. As a result, a child's educational problems received little or no differentiation within this procedure.

The present demand to expand these services only made a bad situation even worse. In most cases what resulted was judicial delays coupled with inappropriate agency selection. While this situation was to vary from state to state, county to county, many delinquent children within the United States felt its press and experienced its inadequacies.

While conditions in Pennsylvania did not reach a crisis state, the entire problem of gathering more information pre-disposed the Shuman Learning Center to seek alternative educational techniques which would not only insure an accurate educational assessment of a delinquent child's needs and abilities but compact enough that it could be done wthin the time constraints of judicial due process.

Functioning out of the Juvenile Court of Allegheny County, the Shuman Learning Center attempted to implement a curriculum assessment procedure which is part of the general educational routine. The educational routine had to service approximately 3500 to 4000 children yearly. What developed was a program called Assessment Teaching Curriculum.

Unlike traditional evaluation entities, Assessment Teaching Curriculum operates in conjunction with established curriculum guidelines as set by the Department of Education.

By limiting the curriculum to Departmental Standards, the child is assured of transferable school time that can be applied to school placement anywhere within the State. This is necessary since the Pennsylvania Department of Education has not yet seen fit to pass specific credit transfer legislation specifically applicable to children in delinquent type institutions. While there is some transfer of educational credits, the mechanism is not uniform and often functions at the whim of local school policy. Course description is the only sure criteria available in the State of Pennsylvania to guarantee credit transfer. It appears inconsequential to many local school district personnel as to whether a child is able to receive course credit, and still worse, whether he can master the course description as presented.

However, at Shuman, whether a child can master a particular course description is very important, and crucial, insofar as post-detention placement. Education failure often means placement failure. In an attempt to alter the current state of affairs, the Shuman Learning Center did the following simple educational procedure.

Initially, specific teachers at the Center were asked to sequence his or her major content area into primary conceptual segments. If and when possible, these concepts were to be placed in rank order according to conceptual difficulty; the easiest first, the next difficult concept second, and so on. The teachers were told, however, that concept sequencing, while important, would not greatly effect the A.T.C. model. Sequencing appears to be discretionary and in most cases will follow teacher bias and experience.

On the other hand, what was crucial was that each content teacher make certain that all necessary concepts were selected and presented so as to enable each student to reach the terminal goal as set by the teacher for that particular area. While concept placement is somewhat arbitrary, concept selection appears to be fairly universal and consistent among teachers regardless of the content area.

Secondly, these teachers were asked to create a curriculum for each concept selected. It was imperative at this stage in the development of A.T.C. that the curriculum to be assigned to each concept de developmental in content and ranked in order of difficulty. By ranking each developmental task accordingly, the curriculum becomes measurable and definable in assessment terms, making the entire learning experience diagnostic in nature. By this method assessment and teaching are made whole.

Since content is based upon large general conceptual norms, curriculum guidelines need not conform to local subject guidelines but can reflect general State norms. A.T.C. is only concerned with those skills which affect the entire content area. Since this is the case, a child's experience after A.T.C. is general enough so as to apply to any new school situation upon release, and specific enough to allow pertinent learning assessment so as to enable a juvenile court proceeding as much information about a child as possible.

If by chance a child is detained over a long period, A.T.C. has the capability of teaching all the necessary concepts within the subject scheme. Regional curriculum differences become pertinent only upon re-entry to a school but not so important as to produce educational failure and non-academic compliance.

Since all area concepts are pre-determined and pre-developed, a new child can enter any area and be immediately assigned a concept. Initially, this is usually done by starting a new child at concept one. However, a child can be shifted immediately to another concept if mastery is evident on that subject scheme.

Because this process is continuous, a child is reviewed over many class settings, making the data collected more reliable and precise. Since evaluation is done via the classroom, a child is not exposed to the rigors of undue testing and personal isolation.

The advantage of A.T.C., beyond what was mentioned, is the fact that teachers and child learning specialists are not overwhelmed with rapid population turnovers experienced by most agencies which deal with crisis oriented child referrals. This system, because it is completed prior to the child's entrance, allows the educational staff the opportunity to spend all available time with children instead of educational materials, making entry and exit from the scheme relatively unimportant.

What should develop as a result of A.T.C. is a uniform educational assessment device which will enable detention home educators, for the first time, to view a delinquent child from a learning conceptual base rather than an arbitrary subject content level. Finally, the process should create an educational synergism between skills and concepts, a rarity in present day detention educational programs.

CAUSES OF ALIENATION WHICH LEAD TO YOUTH CONFLICT

A Paper Presented to the

54th Annual International Convention of the

Council for Exceptional Children

by

Raymond Bell

April, 1976

Graduate School of Education

Lehigh University

Bethlehem, Pennsylvania

CAUSES OF ALIENATION WHICH LEAD TO YOUTH CONFLICT

The problem of the alienated disruptive and the delinquent youth in our society is one which seems to grow at an alarming rate. It is no consolation that the problem appears to be as malignant in other advanced technological societies. The report that over 50% of all major crime reported in the United States last year was committed by youth under the age of 18 and that approximately 3% of all youth eventually appear in juvenile court comes as no surprise, particularly to those of us who are involved in the educational process. When one examines the distribution of known offences it also becomes evident that in some communities the rate of delinquency is as high as 20%. Indeed there are indications that there are significantly more youths involved in non-reported crimes - the so-called "hidden delinquents" - than many of us would believe.

Before I discuss the causes of this "rush to delinquency" from an educator's standpoint, I should like to review some of the patterns of delinquency which seem to have emerged over the past twelve to fifteen years. As late as 1960 the general pattern of delinquency was much as it had been since the mid-twenties.

Most crimes were petty crimes of theft and vandalism and could be labeled as the traditional reaction to authority.

The youths who committed these crimes were usually deterred by a single contact with the criminal justice system.

Most of these youths were in the 16-18 year age bracket.

These factors are still present, of course, but newer and more startling trends are emerging.

Many of the crimes committed are much more serious and sophisticated and involve considerable violence.

Often these crimes are carried out with the aid of weapons.

The average age of the youths committing these crimes is more likely to be younger, under the age of sixteen.

Often the crimes are committed by gangs organized specifically for that purpose.

The crimes are often directed at those in the community most vulnerable to physical assault - the very old or the very young.

The motiation for the act has often been drug-related although, at least in middle class-suburban areas, there seems to be a trend away from drug use and toward the use of cheap wine and liquor, particularly vodka.

The crimes are now often committed in places usually considered safe: public thoroughfares, stores, neighborhood center , and schools.

The young person involved in a delinquent act appears to be less responsive to the traditional controls of family, school, and police than at any other time. This may be the greatest concern of all.

The number of runaways who often have no way to survive except through delinquency is increasing. Figures reported for 1973 indicated 3/4 million runaways. But indications are that there may, indeed, be twice as many. These runaways tend to resort to crime as a means of support and there are increases in the reported incidence of prostitution, malnutrition, and hepatitis in the below seventeen age group.

The problem in schools is no less severe and is the cause for great alarm. The Syracuse University Research Center comments that "the disruption of our high schools is no longer novel or rare. It is current, it is widespread and it is

serious". The recent report from the U.S. Senate entitled "Crime in our Schools - A Report Card: "A" in School Violence and Vandalism", points out that "violence and vandalism is reaching crisis proportions which seriously threaten the ability of our educational system to carry out its primary function. The dismal picture it draws illustrates that in the three years between 1970 and 1973 there was a startling increase in serious crimes within the walls of the Nation's schools: Homicides increased 18.5%; rapes and attempted rapes, 40.1%; robberies, 36.7%; assaults on students 85.3%; assaults on teachers, 77.4%; burglaries of schools, 11.8%; drugs and alcohol offences on school property, 37.5%; and drop-outs, 11.7%.

The cost of vandalism in a school district is, on the average, over $63,000. per year. (U.S. Congress, 1975.) The preceding figures only deal with serious crimes and not with the petty crime and disruptive problems of discipline and disobedience which teachers seem to face on a daily basis at an ever increasing rate. The NEA and the NASSP have done on record as ranking this problem among the most serious facing their respective members. The Gallup Poll conducted for NEA in 1974 indicates that parents and teachers alike are more concerned about the lack of discipline in schools than about anything else (NEA Journal, 1974). Owen Kiernan of NASSP, in testimony before Senator Bayh's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, has pleaded for some action at the highest levels of government to aid educators in their attempts to deal with the problem. It is evident, then, that the national picture seems to indicate that educators desperately seek help, want training, and want support in dealing with the problem.

The positions of the school and the schoolman in this growing turmoil are extraordinarily difficult. They are buffeted by contradictory forces. The

problem of dealing with the alienated and disruptive child in the classroom is of the greatest concern. The Gallup Poll conducted by the National Education Association last year clearly points out the general frustration felt by teachers, administrators, and parents regarding the question of the discipline of students in school. As we have seen, crimes of violence including extreme vandalism, assault and rape are on the increase within the school itself. The National Institute of Education (NIE) has just completed a major study of crime in the schools of America.

The traditional response to acts of disruption and of delinquency was to suspend or expel. However, the general attitude and trend seems to be away from this response and recent court judgments seem to have underlined this trend. There are clear indications that the concept of "Right to Education" and "Due Process" are to be applied equally to the alienated, disruptive, and delinquent as they are to the severely handicapped and mentally retarded.

However, there are no lobby groups, no organized groups of citizens or parents who are available to see that the educational and emotional needs of such students are met in the schools or the communities.

For a most excellent review of the research into the relationship of schools and delinquency and a much more comprehensive statement of the problem than I have presented here, I refer you to Ernest Wenk's article in Crime and Delinquency Literature, June 1974 entitled "Schools and Delinquency."

THis basic conflict is compounded by the apparent contradiction in the general attitude of the parents toward the role of the school. On the one hand they seem to desire a return to a strict emphasis upon the school's role of teaching the "3 R's," while on the other hand, abdicating their own responsibilities of control and problem-solving to the school.

In my opinion, however, the trend is inevitable. The general problems of parents and community and particularly those that relate to youth are being left squarely on the doorstep of the educator. It is a question of "ready or not, here I come" and for educators there are no alternatives. We must face the problem because if we don't, no one else will.

The causes for such alienation, disruption and delinquency have their roots in a complex and confounding series of factors most of them external to the school itself. Sociologists and psychologists have their own suggestions and theories on this question but I feel as educators we can develop our own causal paradigms for alienation.

From the cloud in which these causes are to be founded there seems to emerge three outstanding and critical factors. The first of these is physiological. There is much evidence to support the fact that many students alienated from the school and society have learning disabilities which are caused by physiological factors. Dr. Grignano's own work in screening some 14,000 students passing through the Allegheny County Detention Home in Pittsburgh has indicated that 27% have auditory discrimination problems and that 50% have visual perception problems. The incidence of these difficulties in a normal population is somewhere in the region of 3%.

The second factor seems to be psychological. A child who has an emotional overlay due to trauma in his life for self-evident reasons also seems to have difficulty in general social situations and particularly in school. The causes of the trauma may include, but are not necessarily limited to; child abuse, broken homes where no strong role figure exists, lack of affection or support or where inconsistent parental controls are present. There is of course a link with the physiological factor.

Finally there are larger socio-economic causes for alienation. In observing children in an elementary school in Harlem I have noted that the behaviors of both children and teachers in grades Kindergarten through second are what one would accept in any school in any advanced technological society. However, by third grade, there is an easily identifiable alienation which grows rapidly. I suggest that the child consciously and/or unconsciously recognizes the futility of his life and his relationship to school as it exists in the micro-society that is Harlem. He can rarely, if ever, escape from this milieu and he is justifiably alienated.

It is important, here, to indicate what I am not suggesting. Clearly, I am not saying that a child with physiological problems is going to become alienated, disruptive or delinquent. I am not saying that any child with psychological problems is to become alienated, disruptive or delinquent. Nor am I saying that every child from a disadvantaged economic background is going to be alienated, disruptive or delinquent. However, if two or three of these factors occur together, then the chances are good that the child will indeed be alienated.

This situation is compounded when the child comes in contact with the school. Teachers and administrators are not adequately prepared to deal with this alienated student. As individuals we then respond in bizarre and extreme ways when confronted by the alienated, acting-out, disruptive student. This results in rigid and unreasonable controls for the student or absolute freedom to do as he or she wishes. The institution is no different from the individual in its way of coping with such students. In my observations of large numbers of educational programs for alienated, delinquent and correctional populations in this country and abroad, it would seem that they cluster around each end of the educational continuum.

On one end the "Attila the Hun" approach which is both rigid and punative and on the other end a permissive "let it all hand out and let's rap, man" approach. Clearly both are inappropriate ways to deal with such a client population. Thus the original problem is compounded.

The result of the original problems interacting with an inadequate educational response results in a vicious "triangular" effect. At each corner of this model exist the three characteristics of the alienated youth with which we are all familiar. First comes the low self-esteem that failure brings. This manifests itself in either acting out aggressive behavior or withdrawal and passive agression. At the second corner is the hallmark of a functional deficit in the decision-making process. This is jargon for the fact that the alienated student seems to be a more "reasonable" person to make decisions about his life and actions which seem to be based on the law of maximum regret rather than on the law of minimal regret. Finally, the third hallmark and a natural outgrowth and response to the previous two is that of "self as victim". In order to survive the student must of necessity blame some one else for his misfortune. Logically, then, if everyone's hand is against him he can't be worth very much and thus we are back to the top of our triangle. As time passes this begins a downward progression to more severe alienation which is even greater to prevent or into which successful intervention can rarely be accomplished.

What can be done to intervene in this total process? I believe the problem must be attacked on three fronts. First we must find out, whereever possible, the original cause of the problem. I recognize the difficulties involved but teachers must be prepared much more adequately at both the elementary and secondary level to diagnose and prescribe remediation approaches to deal with the initial problem. They must be equipped to deal with the crises in which the individual student finds himself and then reach out into the system and the community and become an advocate on his behalf. We cannot afford to continue a "compartmentalized" treatment or intervention process. Secondly we must intervene in the self-distructive low self-esteem -

functional deficit in decision-making - self as victim triangulation. To do this, we must develop programs which help kids succeed in school. Basic literacy and vocational skills must be taught. Decisions based on minimal regret must be encouraged and mechanisms to help children do so developed. This must be done in a structured, yet humane environment. I have worked with enough "kids" in trouble to know that freedom to the student going through the turbulence of adolescense becomes a tyranny. Such youth need a visable yet flexible structure against which to push and grow in order for them to be secure.

I feel that in order to help the alienated student we must delve into the "cloud of causality" and we must offer both alternative educational programs within the school and staff them with teachers more adequately trained to deal with their needs. In this we have no alternative. Should we fail, no one else can succeed. Carpe Diem! Seize the day!